



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,680	10/18/2005	Yutaka Matsuoka	043210	8336
38834 7590 04/30/2009 WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP 1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036				
EXAMINER KASHNIKOW, ERIK				
ART UNIT 1794		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 04/30/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/524,680

**Applicant(s)**

MATSUOKA ET AL.

**Examiner**

ERIK KASHNIKOW

**Art Unit**

1794

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Erik Kashnikov.(3) Kenneth Salen.(2) Rena Dye.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 27 April 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: Gregorich et al. (Can J. Soil Sci. 68: 395-403) and Sakaya et al. (US 5,942,298).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative specifically discussed the 103 rejection over the Sakaya and Gregorich references, and why it is believed that the Gregorich reference clearly fails to teach the deficiencies of Sakaya. The examiner has agreed to carefully consider applicant's arguments upon filing of the next response...

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Rena L. Dye/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794